



Iowa Smart Planning Task Force Comprehensive Planning Committee

Workgroup: Local Comprehensive Planning

Date: August 11, 2010

Chair: Les Beck

Scope of group's work:

- 1) Develop statewide goals for comprehensive planning that utilize the Iowa Smart Planning Principles and develop recommendations for a process to measure progress toward achieving those goals.
- 2) Review city and county comprehensive plans to determine the number of such plans that address the hazards as listed in the Hazards Element of the suggested local comprehensive plan guidelines and the adequacy of such plans in addressing those hazards.
- 3) Evaluate and develop incentives to conduct local and regional comprehensive planning, including but not limited to state financial and technical assistance.
- 4) Recommend the means by which technical and financial assistance for comprehensive planning can be provided and administered.

Participants:

Name	Organization	Email
Les Beck	Iowa State Association of Counties	les.beck@linncounty.org
Paula Mohr	Dept. of Cultural Affairs	paula.mohr@iowa.gov
Jessica Harder	Iowa League of Cities	jessicaharder@iowaleague.org
David Wilwerding	American Planning Association	dwilwerding@ci.johnston.ia.us
Chad Keune	ACB/Ruhl & Ruhl	chad@acbiowa.com
Stuart Crine	Dept. of Public Safety	crine@dps.state.ia.us
Rep. Tom Schueller	State Representative, Democrat	Tom.schueller@legis.state.ia.us
Deb Kozel	Legislative Services	Deb.kozel@legis.state.ia.us
Mary Beth Mellick	Iowa State Association of Councils (ISAC)	mbmellick@iowacounties.org
Jace Mikels	Iowa Senate Democrats	Jace.mikels@legis.state.ia.us

Presenters/Experts: N/A

Name	Organization	Email	Category



Workgroup Assignments for Next Meeting (August 24th):

- Review draft recommendations for Hazards Element
- Review draft process for goal measurement
- Review draft recommendations for State of Iowa Goals

Notes:

I. Hazards Element

- A short evaluation sheet was created to determine if a comprehensive plan incorporates the “Hazards Element” as defined in the legislation. Staff sampled nine cities and three counties (in the population tiers used for representation on the Task Force) for adequacy. None of the comprehensive plans contained a Hazards Element. A draft report was given to the workgroup member’s and reviewed. (*Jenna Anderson*)
- **Discussion**
 - What is the importance of integrating the hazard mitigation plan into the comprehensive plan? (*Stuart Crine*)
 - Currently, the plans could be incompatible. Integration makes sure the hazards (especially those that can be mitigated through land use measures) are considered.
 - Just mentioning a hazard mitigation plan in the comprehensive plan does not accomplish anything. The word “shall” in the legislation means that all smart plans must address catastrophic flooding. Since a “Hazards” section is a logical place to address this, let’s build recommendations around that. (*Les Beck*)
 - Water needs to be addressed in every plan. Communities should always look at what could go wrong and tailor land uses to mitigating the effects of flooding. (*Chad Keune*)
 - Can we link this to the incentives? (*Paula Mohr*)
 - Can we provide examples of how to integrate? (*Stuart Crine*)
- **Recommendations**
 - At a minimum, the Hazards Element section of a Smart Plan should consider and coordinate with the FEMA



approved Hazard Mitigation Plan and must address catastrophic flooding.

- Include the requirement of a “Hazards Element” into the requirement of a Smart Plan for state program funding where appropriate (whether as criteria or for additional points/priority).
- Create a model of a Hazards Element as part of the “toolbox” for communities.

II. State of Iowa Planning Goals

- **Draft Document**

- Three goals broken down into 10 policies and 36 benchmarks.
- Benchmarks are directional (i.e. increase or decrease)
- Matrix compares the benchmarks to the Smart Planning Principles
- **Land Use**
 - Everything stems off from identifying Smart Planning Areas and Protection Areas
- **Participation and Education**
 - Focuses on building capacity
- **Resources and Assistance**
 - Focuses on developing the toolbox
- Les Beck is also going to review the DOE’s energy benchmarks as an example (www.energy.gov)

- **Discussion**

- **All in the workgroup agreed on the state goals with a few minor changes:**
 - **Policy 1.2-** Change last sentence in opening paragraph to: “Incompatible development in protected areas should be discouraged or prohibited.” to account for historical and cultural districts.
 - **Benchmark 1.4.2-** Add IGCC to list of nationally recognized programs.
 - **Policy 2.2-** Add language to opening paragraph to target youth and schools in addition to the general public.
- **Measuring the benchmarks**
 - Who does the measuring and collection/reporting of data?
 - **Local Up Approach**



- *Matrix can be part of toolbox to guide localities on measuring benchmarks*
 - What about staff capacity/capabilities?
 - What if the benchmarks are not applicable?
 - Who are they reporting to? COGs? The State? Which agency?
 - Is reporting mandatory? Who has oversight?
 - How will the data be used/ reported out?
- **COGs Approach**
 - *COGs can collect data from member governments and synthesize report*
 - What about the “donut hole”?
 - Can the COGs come together to create a state-wide report?
 - What is incentivizing the COGs to do collect the data?
- **State Approach**
 - *A state agency or state-wide entity (like League of Cities) would collect data to measure progress toward state goals, report out on a regular basis and use the report to adjust, create, or dissolve planning programs as needed.*
 - What agency is going to do this? This may hinge on the overarching question of “who is going to coordinate planning at the state level?”
 - Would this be a sampling or a comprehensive data collection?
 - How often would a report need to be created?
- The workgroup needs to further consider which approach is best suited to measuring the benchmarks. Staff will aggregate any comments and develop a draft recommendation for the measurement process for review by the workgroup on August 24th.